

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF DELAWARE

|                            |   |                     |
|----------------------------|---|---------------------|
| ROBERT BOSCH, LLC,         | ) |                     |
|                            | ) |                     |
| Plaintiff,                 | ) |                     |
|                            | ) |                     |
| v.                         | ) | Civ. No. 08-542-SLR |
|                            | ) |                     |
| PYLON MANUFACTURING CORP., | ) |                     |
|                            | ) |                     |
| Defendant.                 | ) |                     |
| _____                      | ) |                     |

**VERDICT SHEET**

Dated: April 22, 2010

We, the jury, unanimously find as follows:

**I. U.S. Patent No. 6,292,974 ("The '974 Patent")**

**A. Invalidity**

1. Do you find that Pylon has proven, by clear and convincing evidence, that any of the asserted claims of the '974 patent are invalid as being obvious in view of the prior art?

*Checking "no" below indicates a finding for Bosch.*

*Checking "yes" below indicates a finding for Pylon. For any "yes" response, please place a check in the box next to each item of prior art that you are relying on in reaching your obviousness decision.*

| Claim | No                       | Yes                                 | Prior Art  |
|-------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--|
| 1     | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> U.S. Patent No. 3,879,793<br><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> U.S. Patent No. 3,881,214<br><input type="checkbox"/> U.S. Patent No. 3,942,212<br><input type="checkbox"/> U.S. Patent No. 5,325,564 |
| 8     | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> U.S. Patent No. 3,879,793<br><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> U.S. Patent No. 3,881,214<br><input type="checkbox"/> U.S. Patent No. 3,942,212<br><input type="checkbox"/> U.S. Patent No. 5,325,564            |

2. Do you find that Pylon has proven, by clear and convincing evidence, that any of the asserted claims of the '974 patent are invalid because one or more named inventors did not himself invent the claimed subject matter but, instead, learned of it from another?

*Question 2 continues on the next page.*

*Question 2, continued.*

*Checking "no" below indicates a finding for Bosch.*

*Checking "yes" below indicates a finding for Pylon. For any "yes" response, please place a check in the box next to the prior inventor(s).*

| Claim | No                       | Yes                                 | Prior Inventor(s)  |
|-------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--|
| 1     | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Johannes Fehrsen<br><input type="checkbox"/> Adriaan Swanepoel |
| 8     | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Johannes Fehrsen<br><input type="checkbox"/> Adriaan Swanepoel |

## II. U.S. Patent No. 6,675,434 ("The '434 Patent")

### A. Infringement

3. Do you find that Bosch has proven, by a preponderance of the evidence, that any of Pylon's Generation 1, 2 or 3 wiper blades infringe any of the asserted claims of the '434 patent?

*Checking "yes" below indicates a finding for Bosch.*

*Checking "no" below indicates a finding for Pylon.*

| Accused Product | Claim 1 |    | Claim 5 |    | Claim 7 |    | Claim 13 |    |
|-----------------|---------|----|---------|----|---------|----|----------|----|
|                 | Yes     | No | Yes     | No | Yes     | No | Yes      | No |
| Generation 1    | ✓       |    |         |    |         |    | ✓        |    |
| Generation 2    | ✓       |    | ✓       |    |         | ✓  | ✓        |    |
| Generation 3    | ✓       |    | ✓       |    |         | ✓  | ✓        |    |

**B. Invalidity**

4. Do you find that Pylon has proven, by clear and convincing evidence, that any of the asserted claims of the '434 patent are invalid as being obvious in view of the prior art?

*Checking "no" below indicates a finding for Bosch.*

*Checking "yes" below indicates a finding for Pylon. For any "yes" response, please place a check in the box next to each item of prior art that you are relying on in reaching your obviousness decision.*

| Claim | No                                  | Yes                                 | Prior Art  |
|-------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--|
| 1     | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> U.S. Patent No. 3,083,394<br><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> U.S. Patent No. 3,116,507<br><input type="checkbox"/> U.S. Patent No. 5,325,564 |
| 5     | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> U.S. Patent No. 3,083,394<br><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> U.S. Patent No. 3,116,507<br><input type="checkbox"/> U.S. Patent No. 5,325,564 |
| 7     | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/> U.S. Patent No. 3,083,394<br><input type="checkbox"/> U.S. Patent No. 3,116,507<br><input type="checkbox"/> U.S. Patent No. 5,325,564                       |
| 13    | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/> U.S. Patent No. 3,083,394<br><input type="checkbox"/> U.S. Patent No. 3,116,507<br><input type="checkbox"/> U.S. Patent No. 5,325,564                       |

### III. U.S. Patent No. 6,944,905 ("The '905 Patent")

#### A. Infringement

5. Do you find that Bosch has proven, by a preponderance of the evidence, that any of Pylon's Generation 1, 2 or 3 wiper blades infringe Claim 13 of the '905 patent?

*Checking "yes" below indicates a finding for Bosch.*

*Checking "no" below indicates a finding for Pylon.*

| Accused Product | Claim 13 |    |
|-----------------|----------|----|
|                 | Yes      | No |
| Generation 1    | ✓        |    |
| Generation 2    | ✓        |    |
| Generation 3    | ✓        |    |

#### B. Invalidity

6. Do you find that Pylon has proven, by clear and convincing evidence, that claim 13 of the '905 patent is invalid as being obvious in view of the prior art?

*Question 6 continues on the next page.*

*Question 6, continued.*

*Checking "no" below indicates a finding for Bosch.*

*Checking "yes" below indicates a finding for Pylon. For any "yes" response, please place a check in the box next to each item of prior art that you are relying on in reaching your obviousness decision.*

| Claim | No                                  | Yes                      | Prior Art  |
|-------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--|
| 13    | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> U.S. Patent No. 6,279,191<br><input type="checkbox"/> British Patent GB 2,106,775<br><input type="checkbox"/> PCT WO 99/02383 |